

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 108455
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 PM-05 H-01 INR-10 L-03
PA-01 SP-02 SS-15 ACDA-12 TRSE-00 MCE-00 OIC-02
/064 R

DRAFTED YBY: OSD/ISA: RFISS
APPROVED BY: EUR: JEGOODBY
PM/ISP: MMICHAUD (SUBS)
EUR/RPM: SJLEDOGAR
OSD/ISA: COL. PFEIFFER
NSC: JTHOMSON (SUBS)
DDR AND E: M. LEONARD
-----085557 281045Z /13/70

O P 280118Z APR 78
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USIMMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS PRIORITY
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS PRIORITY
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN PRIORITY
USLOSACLANT NORFOLK PRIORITY
CINCLANT NORFOLK PRIORITY
USDELMC BRUSSELS PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 108455

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (PARA 3, LINE 6 OMITTED)

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS:MPOL, NATO

SUBJECT:LONG TERM DEFENSE PROGRAM - EWG MEETING 2 MAY

REFS: A. USNATO 04220 DTG 251820Z APR 78; B. AC/281 (LTP) UP
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 108455

(78)2(2D REVISE); C. USNATO 04269 DTG 261719Z APR 78

1. WE AGREE GENERALLY WITH MOST MISSION VIEWS AND PROPOSALS
IN REFS A AND C INCLUDING STRONG DEFENSE OF THE TEXT AGAINST
DEBILITATING NATIONAL FOOTNOTES. FYI. WE ANTICIPATE MANY
OF THESE WILL FALL OFF AT HIGHER LEVELS. FOR EXAMPLE,
INFORMAL ADVICES FROM MOD BONN ARE FAVORABLE. END FYI.
EXCEPT AS INDICATED OTHERWISE BELOW YOU MAY PROCEED.
MISSION SHOULD ALSO HOLD FIRM ON THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, SOME
OF WHICH MAY OVERLAP YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS.

2. RE PARA 4, REF A, YOU SHOULD NOT SEEK CHANGE IN WORKING OF PARA 16, REF 6, FROM "FEASIBILITY STUDY" TO "STUDY."

3. WE PROPOSE TO HOLD FIRM ON BRACKETED US TEXTS DESCRIBING PROGRAMS REFERRED TO HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT (PARA 5, REF A AND REF C) ON GROUNDS THAT THEY ARE NOT REALLY CONTROVERSIAL FOR MOST PART. HOWEVER, WHERE OUR PARAS PARTLY DUPLICATE THE IMMEDIATELY PREVIOUS PARAS YOU CAN ACCEPT MODIFIED WORDING OR MELDING. MOREOVER, YOU SHOULD REPLACE WORDS "SINGLE MANAGER" WITH "PROGRAM COORDINATOR."

4. WITH REGARD TO THE PACKAGE DEAL REFERRED TO IN PARA 5, REF A, WE WOULD NOT WISH TO AGREE TO WORDS "ENDORSE THE OBJECTIVES OF" IN LIEU OF "ENDORSE" IN PARA 41(A), REF B. BUT WE COULD DROP PHRASE "AS A WHOLE" IF THIS WOULD EASE PROBLEM.

5. RE PARA 20, REF B. DELETE THIRD SENTENCE. THIS STATEMENT GIVES UNDUE PRIORITY TO MARITIME POSTURE IN COMPARISON WITH THE NINE OTHER LTDP PROGRAMS.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 108455

WE SEE NO NEED TO INCLUDE AN ALTERNATIVE STATEMENT AS THE PARA STANDS BY ITSELF.

6. WE COULD ACCEPT MISSION TEXT FOR PARA 23 BIS (PARA 6, REF A) IF YOU REWORD THE SECOND AND THIRD SENTENCES INTO ONE SENTENCE WHICH WOULD READ:
"THIS WOULD INVOLVE A MAJOR DEGREE OF INTEGRATION FOR NATO'S AIR DEFENSE FORCES AND EXTENSIVE ALLIANCE COOPERATION AS ESSENTIAL IF NATO IS TO RESPOND TO THE RAPIDLY INCREASING CAPABILITY OF THE WARSAW PACT FOR OFFENSIVE AIR OPERATIONS."

7. RE PARA 10, REF A, YOU CAN ACCEPT REFERENCE TO US PREPOSITIONING PLANS IN PARA 41C, REF B, UNLESS THE LANGUAGE ON EUROPEAN ALLIED SUPPORT IS WEAKENED. ACTUALLY WE FEEL THAT LANGUAGE ON ALLIED FACILITIES IS TOO WEAK AND WANT YOU TO TRY OUT AS ALTERNATIVE OF FINAL CLAUSE "PROVIDED THAT THE EUROPEAN ALLIES PROVIDE THE NECESSARY FACILITIES." BUT IF LANGUAGE IS WEAKENED INSTEAD, YOU SHOULD POINT OUT THAT THIS PLACES US OFFER IN JEOPARDY, REMINDING ALLIES OF PREVIOUS US POSITION AT 21 MAR EWG THAT IF ALLIES DIDN'T COME THROUGH US WOULD REVIEW ITS OWN COMMITMENTS.

FYI. CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION TO PREFINANCING OF FACILITIES MAY KNOCK PROPOSED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR THE FIRST DIVISION OUT OF FY 79 BUDGET MARK UP.

THERE IS A STRONG FEELING IN AT LEAST TWO OF THE FOUR COMMITTEES CONCERNED THAT THESE TYPES OF FACILITIES SHOULD BE FUNDED DIRECTLY FROM INFRASTRUCTURE AND INCLUDED IN EARLY SLICES, AND THAT FUNDING BY THE ALLIANCE SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO MEET THE DEADLINE OF THE EQUIPMENT FOR ONE DIVISION IN PLACE BY END FY 80 AND THE EQUIPMENT FOR THE OTHER TWO BY END OF FY 82. END FYI.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 108455

8. ANNEX A (READINESS)

A. PARA 11B, REF A. AGREE BUT WE FEEL WHOLE PARAGRAPH ON DUTCH BRIGADE IS TOO WEAK. IN LIGHT OF SHAPE PROPOSALS, FRG AGREEMENTS TO PAY ITS SHARE OF COSTS, AND THE UK AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE, REQUEST YOU CONCERT WITH SHAPE, UK, AND FRG DELEGATES TO CHANGE WORDING TO OMIT "CONTINUE MULTILATERAL DISCUSSIONS" AND SUBSTITUTE "SHOULD IMPROVE THE REACTION TIME OF" ETC. THEN OMIT "CONSIDERATION OF." WE RECOGNIZE DUTCH WILL BALK AT THIS BUT WOULD PREFER TO CARRY SPLIT AT LEAST TO DPC IF FRG AND HOPEFULLY UK WILL SUPPORT. THIS IS BEST WAY TO KEEP PRESSURE ON DUTCH.

B. PARA 11D, REF A. WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND OR AGREE WITH THE REINSTATEMENT IN THE "OTHER FORCES PREFERABLY EARMARKED CATEGORY" IN APPENDIX 2 OF US "3 DIVISION (INCLUDING 1 MARINE) AND 1 BRIGADE EQUIVALENT" SINCE IT HAD PREVIOUSLY BEEN DELETED AT OUR REQUEST. THESE WORDS SHOULD BE DELETED, SINCE RETENTION OF THESE FORCES IN THE "NATIONAL COMMAND" CATEGORY IS NECESSARY FOR US PLANNING FLEXIBILITY IN REACTING TO OTHER THAN NATO CONTINGENCIES. FYI. JCS STRONGLY URGE THE RETENTION OF THESE FORCES IN THE "NATIONAL COMMAND" CATEGORY AND IT WOULD CREATE DIFFICULTIES TO DO OTHERWISE AT THIS TIME. END FYI.

9. ANNEX B (REINFORCEMENT) - AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION REF A. BUT IF ATTEMPT IS MADE TO WEAKEN LANGUAGE ON HOST-NATION SUPPORT OF US PREPOSITIONING HEAVY EQUIPMENT FOR THREE ADDITIONAL DIVISIONS IN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 108455

CENTRAL REGION BY 1982 (PARA 6(A) AND PARA 8(B) REF B), YOU SHOULD MAKE SAME POINTS AS PARA 7 ABOVE.

10. ANNEX C (RESERVE MOBILIZATION). AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION IN REF A. BUT LANGUAGE OF PARA 5(B) IS ALREADY SO WEAK AND CONDITIONAL THAT IT SHOULD

NOT BE WEAKENED FURTHER. WE AGREE THAT THIS IS ISSUE FOR POLITICAL LEVEL TO RESOLVE.

11. ANNEX D (MARITIME POSTURE).

A. PARA 3, REF B. DELETE SECOND SENTENCE FOR SAME REASON AS PARA 5 ABOVE.

B. SUGGEST DELETING PARA 12(D)(III) AND SUBSTITUTING (OR ADDING AS A SEPARATE PARA) THE FOLLOWING: "STUDY AS A MATTER OF URGENCY NATO MINING PLANS AND CURRENT INVENTORY OF MINES IN ORDER TO DETERMINE VALID NATO MINE INVENTORY REQUIREMENTS. FYI. WE UNDERSTAND SACLANT WILL SUPPORT. IF SACLANT REP WILL INTRODUCE YOU CAN SUPPORT. END FYI.

C. PARA 14B, REF A. WE CAN AGREE WITH CURRENT WORDING OF PARA 12(E)(III) OF REF B PROVIDING WORDS "IF APPLICABLE TO OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND' ARE INSERTED BEFORE THE WORDS "IF TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE."

12. ANNEX E (AIR DEFENSE). AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION - REF A. YOU SHOULD STAND FIRM ON AEW ISSUE AT 2 MAY MEETING EMPHASIZING IMPORTANCE OF AEW TO INTEGRATED AIR DEFENSE PROGRAM. FYI. FOOT DRAGGING BY FRG ON AEW OUTSIDE OF LTDP COUPLED WITH A SUCCESSFUL EFFORT TO DROP IT FROM TF-5 COULD BE DANGEROUS TO OVERALL AEW EFFORT. KEEPING AEW IN THE LTDP WILL GIVE US ADDED LEVERAGE IN OVERCOMING ALLIED RELUCTANCE TO PROCEED. END FYI.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 108455

13. ANNEX F (C3): AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION - REF A. IN VIEW OF YOUR INTENTION TO JOIN THE CONSENSUS, WHICH WE SUPPORT, RECOMMEND US PRESS ALLIES TO ELIMINATE AS MANY RESERVATIONS AS POSSIBLE AND OPPOSE WEAKENING.

14. ANNEX G (EW): AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION - REF A, BUT OPPOSE WEAKENING.

15. ANNEX H (RATIONALIZATION): AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION, REF A, EXCEPT THAT:

A. RE PARA 18A, REF A, YOUR PROPOSED INSERTION TO PARA 12(A) (III), REF B, SHOULD BE CHANGED SO THAT THE PARA WOULD READ:

"THAT THE CNAD AD HOC STUDY GROUP ON PAPS PROVIDE BY DECEMBER 1978 A MANAGERIAL AND PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK FOR HARMONIZING TACTICAL CONCEPTS, FOR IDENTIFYING AND ANALYZING ALLIANCE MISSION NEEDS,

AND FOR INCORPORATING SUCH MISSION NEEDS INTO NATIONAL WEAPONS ACQUISITION PLANNING CYCLES." REASON: IT WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE TO DEVELOP A COMPLETE SYSTEM BY DECEMBER 1978 BUT WE SHOULD AT LEAST DEVELOP THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE SYSTEM. THE EVENTUAL SYSTEM WOULD NOT DEVELOP TACTICAL CONCEPTS. THEY WOULD BE DEVELOPED ELSEWHERE AND HARMONIZED BY THE SYSTEM. ALSO, NATO MUST ANALYZE THE MISSION NEEDS IDENTIFIED BEFORE INCORPORATION INTO NATIONAL CYCLES.

B. RE PARA 18B, REF A, WE DO NOT AGREE WITH DROPPING OUR FOOTNOTE ON PARA 12(B)(IV), REF B. ALTHOUGH CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 108455

CONSIDERATION OF ORGANIZATION CHANGES MAY BE POSTPONED UNTIL AFTER THE SUMMIT, WE SHOULD NOT FALL OFF OUR POSITION ON STRENGTHENING MAS WITH WHICH (AS YOU INDICATE) THE EWG AGREED PREVIOUSLY. HOWEVER, WE COULD AGREE AS TRADEOFFS TO DROPPING THE NONDESCRIPT SUB-POINTS IN PARA 12(B)(IV), WHICH LIMIT MORE THAN THEY ADD.

16. ANNEX J (CONSUMER LOGISTICS):

A. RE PARA 19A, REF A, WE AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION EXCEPT THAT YOUR FINAL FALLBACK POSITION FOR THE DPC/PS SHOULD ALSO CHANGE THE WORDS "ESTABLISHED IN HEADQUARTERS AFCENT." FYI. ADDING A FEW ADDITIONAL LOGISTIC PERSONNEL TO AFCENT STAFF WILL NOT PROVIDE THE CAPABILITY NECESSARY TO IMPROVE THE LOGISTIC COORDINATION CAPABILITY SO URGENTLY NEEDED. A SEPARATE AGENCY UNDER AFCENT WILL PROVIDE THE CAPABILITY FOR EXPANSION TO MEET THE LOGISTICS IMPROVEMENTS WE ARE SEEKING TO MAKE. END FYI.

B. WE AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION IN PARA 19B, REF A, EXCEPT YOU SHOULD NOT CONCUR IN THE DELETION OF THE WORDS "AN ADDITIONAL" IN LINE 6, PARA 7, REF B, AS REQUESTED BY BELGIUM AND FRG IN FOOTNOTE (3).

C. WE AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION IN PARA 19F, REF A, EXCEPT THAT YOU SHOULD TRY TO USE FALLBACK POSITION IN EWG IN THE FACE OF CONTINUED CONSENSUS OPPOSITION. HOWEVER WE WISH STRONG STATEMENT IN EWG ON NEED TO FACE UP TO GREATER NATO LOGISTIC ROLE.

17. IN ADDITION WE SHOULD INSIST THAT COVER NOTE BY THE CHAIRMAN, EWG, FORWARDING THE REPORT TO THE SECRETARY GENERAL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 108455

TO INSURE THAT THE NECESSARY FOLLOW-UP IS MADE ON
SUBSIDIARY MEASURES IN TASK FORCE REPORTS WHICH
ARE NOT TAKEN UP IN THE COMPREHENSIVE REPORT:
"CONCERNING THE SUBSIDIARY MEASURES DISCUSSED IN
PARA 9, THE EWG WILL PREPARE THE NECESSARY
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DPC IN PERMANENT SESSION FOR
THE ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POST-SUMMIT
REVIEW OF ALL TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS NOT TAKEN
UP IN THE LTDP COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.

VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 108455
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /013 R

66011

DRAFTED BY DUR/RPE:WSALISBURY:CFS
APPROVED BY EUR/RPE:WSALISBURY

-----022976 050556Z /21

R 050300Z MAY 78

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS 0000

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 108455

USEEC

FOL RPT STATE 108455 SENT ACTION USNATO INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS,
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS, USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER, USLOSACLANT NORFOLK,
CINCLANT NORFOLK & USDELMC BRUSSELS DTD 28 APR 78

QUOTE C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 108455

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS:MPOL, NATO

SUBJECT:LONG TERM DEFENSE PROGRAM - EWG MEETING 2 MAY

REFS: A. USNATO 04220 DTG 251820Z APR 78; B. AC/281 (LTP) UP
(78)2(2D REVISE); C. USNATO 04269 DTG 261719Z APR 78

1. WE AGREE GENERALLY WITH MOST MISSION VIEWS AND PROPOSALS
IN REFS A AND C INCLUDING STRONG DEFENSE OF THE TEXT AGAINST
DEBILITATING NATIONAL FOOTNOTES. FYI. WE ANTICIPATE MANY
OF THESE WILL FALL OFF AT HIGHER LEVELS. FOR EXAMPLE,
INFORMAL ADVICES FROM MOD BONN ARE FAVORABLE. END FYI.

EXCEPT AS INDICATED OTHERWISE BELOW YOU MAY PROCEED.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 108455

MISSION SHOULD ALSO HOLD FIRM ON THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, SOME OF WHICH MAY OVERLAP YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS.

2. RE PARA 4, REF A, YOU SHOULD NOT SEEK CHANGE IN WORKING OF PARA 16, REF 6, FROM "FEASIBILITY STUDY" TO "STUDY."

3. WE PROPOSE TO HOLD FIRM ON BRACKETED US TEXTS DESCRIBING PROGRAMS REFERRED TO HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT (PARA 5, REF A AND REF C) ON GROUNDS THAT THEY ARE NOT REALLY CONTROVERSIAL FOR MOST PART. HOWEVER, WHERE OUR PARAS PARTLY DUPLICATE THE IMMEDIATELY PREVIOUS PARAS YOU CAN ACCEPT MODIFIED WORDING OR MELDING. MOREOVER, YOU SHOULD REPLACE WORDS "SINGLE MANAGER" WITH "PROGRAM COORDINATOR."

4. WITH REGARD TO THE PACKAGE DEAL REFERRED TO IN PARA 5, REF A, WE WOULD NOT WISH TO AGREE TO WORDS "ENDORSE THE OBJECTIVES OF" IN LIEU OF "ENDORSE" IN PARA 41(A), REF B. BUT WE COULD DROP PHRASE "AS A WHOLE" IF THIS WOULD EASE PROBLEM.

5. RE PARA 20, REF B. DELETE THIRD SENTENCE. THIS STATEMENT GIVES UNDUE PRIORITY TO MARITIME POSTURE IN COMPARISON WITH THE NINE OTHER LTDP PROGRAMS. WE SEE NO NEED TO INCLUDE AN ALTERNATIVE STATEMENT AS THE PARA STANDS BY ITSELF.

6. WE COULD ACCEPT MISSION TEXT FOR PARA 23 BIS (PARA 6, REF A) IF YOU REWORD THE SECOND AND THIRD SENTENCES INTO ONE SENTENCE WHICH WOULD READ:
"THIS WOULD INVOLVE A MAJOR DEGREE OF INTEGRATION FOR NATO'S AIR DEFENSE FORCES AND EXTENSIVE ALLIANCE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 108455

COOPERATION AS ESSENTIAL IF NATO IS TO RESPOND TO THE RAPIDLY INCREASING CAPABILITY OF THE WARSAW PACT FOR OFFENSIVE AIR OPERATIONS."

7. RE PARA 10, REF A, YOU CAN ACCEPT REFERENCE TO US PREPOSITIONING PLANS IN PARA 41C, REF B, UNLESS THE LANGUAGE ON EUROPEAN ALLIED SUPPORT IS WEAKENED. ACTUALLY WE FEEL THAT LANGUAGE ON ALLIED FACILITIES IS TOO WEAK AND WANT YOU TO TRY OUT AS ALTERNATIVE OF FINAL CLAUSE "PROVIDED THAT THE EUROPEAN ALLIES PROVIDE THE NECESSARY FACILITIES." BUT IF LANGUAGE IS WEAKENED INSTEAD, YOU SHOULD POINT OUT THAT THIS

PLACES US OFFER IN JEOPARDY, REMINDING ALLIES OF PREVIOUS US POSITION AT 21 MAR EWG THAT IF ALLIES DIDN'T COME THROUGH US WOULD REVIEW ITS OWN COMMITMENTS.

FYI. CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION TO PREFINANCING OF FACILITIES MAY KNOCK PROPOSED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR THE FIRST DIVISION OUT OF FY 79 BUDGET MARK UP. THERE IS A STRONG FEELING IN AT LEAST TWO OF THE FOUR COMMITTEES CONCERNED THAT THESE TYPES OF FACILITIES SHOULD BE FUNDED DIRECTLY FROM INFRASTRUCTURE AND INCLUDED IN EARLY SLICES, AND THAT FUNDING BY THE ALLIANCE SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO MEET THE DEADLINE OF THE EQUIPMENT FOR ONE DIVISION IN PLACE BY END FY 80 AND THE EQUIPMENT FOR THE OTHER TWO BY END OF FY 82. END FYI.

8. ANNEX A (READINESS)

A. PARA 11B, REF A. AGREE BUT WE FEEL WHOLE PARAGRAPH ON DUTCH BRIGADE IS TOO WEAK. IN LIGHT OF SHAPE PROPOSALS, FRG AGREEMENTS TO PAY ITS SHARE OF COSTS, AND THE UK AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE, REQUEST YOU CONCERT WITH SHAPE, UK, AND FRG DELEGATES TO CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 108455

CHANGE WORDING TO OMIT "CONTINUE MULTILATERAL DISCUSSIONS" AND SUBSTITUTE "SHOULD IMPROVE THE REACTION TIME OF" ETC. THEN OMIT "CONSIDERATION OF." WE RECOGNIZE DUTCH WILL BALK AT THIS BUT WOULD PREFER TO CARRY SPLIT AT LEAST TO DPC IF FRG AND HOPEFULLY UK WILL SUPPORT. THIS IS BEST WAY TO KEEP PRESSURE ON DUTCH.

B. PARA 11D, REF A. WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND OR AGREE WITH THE REINSTATEMENT IN THE "OTHER FORCES PREFERABLY EARMARKED CATEGORY" IN APPENDIX 2 OF US "3 DIVISION (INCLUDING 1 MARINE) AND 1 BRIGADE EQUIVALENT" SINCE IT HAD PREVIOUSLY BEEN DELETED AT OUR REQUEST. THESE WORDS SHOULD BE DELETED, SINCE RETENTION OF THESE FORCES IN THE "NATIONAL COMMAND" CATEGORY IS NECESSARY FOR US PLANNING FLEXIBILITY IN REACTING TO OTHER THAN NATO CONTINGENCIES. FYI. JCS STRONGLY URGE THE RETENTION OF THESE FORCES IN THE "NATIONAL COMMAND" CATEGORY AND IT WOULD CREATE DIFFICULTIES TO DO OTHERWISE AT THIS TIME. END FYI.

9. ANNEX B (REINFORCEMENT) - AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION REF A. BUT IF ATTEMPT IS MADE TO WEAKEN LANGUAGE ON HOST-NATION SUPPORT OF US PREPOSITIONING HEAVY EQUIPMENT FOR THREE ADDITIONAL DIVISIONS IN CENTRAL REGION BY 1982 (PARA 6(A) AND PARA 8(B))

REF B), YOU SHOULD MAKE SAME POINTS AS PARA 7 ABOVE.

10. ANNEX C (RESERVE MOBILIZATION). AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION IN REF A. BUT LANGUAGE OF PARA 5(B) IS ALREADY SO WEAK AND CONDITIONAL THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE WEAKENED FURTHER. WE AGREE THAT THIS IS ISSUE FOR POLITICAL LEVEL TO RESOLVE.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 108455

11. ANNEX D (MARITIME POSTURE).

A. PARA 3, REF B. DELETE SECOND SENTENCE FOR SAME REASON AS PARA 5 ABOVE.

B. SUGGEST DELETING PARA 12(D)(III) AND SUBSTITUTING (OR ADDING AS A SEPARATE PARA) THE FOLLOWING: "STUDY AS A MATTER OF URGENCY NATO MINING PLANS AND CURRENT INVENTORY OF MINES IN ORDER TO DETERMINE VALID NATO MINE INVENTORY REQUIREMENTS. FYI. WE UNDERSTAND SACLANT WILL SUPPORT. IF SACLANT REP WILL INTRODUCE YOU CAN SUPPORT. END FYI.

C. PARA 14B, REF A. WE CAN AGREE WITH CURRENT WORDING OF PARA 12(E)(III) OF REF B PROVIDING WORDS "IF APPLICABLE TO OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND' ARE INSERTED BEFORE THE WORDS "IF TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE."

12. ANNEX E (AIR DEFENSE). AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION - REF A. YOU SHOULD STAND FIRM ON AEW ISSUE AT 2 MAY MEETING EMPHASIZING IMPORTANCE OF AEW TO INTEGRATED AIR DEFENSE PROGRAM. FYI. FOOT DRAGGING BY FRG ON AEW OUTSIDE OF LTDP COUPLED WITH A SUCCESSFUL EFFORT TO DROP IT FROM TF-5 COULD BE DANGEROUS TO OVERALL AEW EFFORT. KEEPING AEW IN THE LTDP WILL GIVE US ADDED LEVERAGE IN OVERCOMING ALLIED RELUCTANCE TO PROCEED. END FYI.

13. ANNEX F (C3): AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION - REF A. IN VIEW OF YOUR INTENTION TO JOIN THE CONSENSUS, WHICH WE SUPPORT, RECOMMEND US PRESS ALLIES TO ELIMINATE AS MANY RESERVATIONS AS POSSIBLE AND OPPOSE WEAKENING.

14. ANNEX G (EW): AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION - REF A,
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 108455

BUT OPPOSE WEAKENING.

15. ANNEX H (RATIONALIZATION): AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION, REF A, EXCEPT THAT:

A. RE PARA 18A, REF A, YOUR PROPOSED INSERTION TO PARA 12(A) (III), REF B, SHOULD BE CHANGED SO THAT THE PARA WOULD READ:

"THAT THE CNAD AD HOC STUDY GROUP ON PAPS PROVIDE BY DECEMBER 1978 A MANAGERIAL AND PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK FOR HARMONIZING TACTICAL CONCEPTS, FOR IDENTIFYING AND ANALYZING ALLIANCE MISSION NEEDS, AND FOR INCORPORATING SUCH MISSION NEEDS INTO NATIONAL WEAPONS ACQUISITION PLANNING CYCLES." REASON: IT WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE TO DEVELOP A COMPLETE SYSTEM BY DECEMBER 1978 BUT WE SHOULD AT LEAST DEVELOP THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE SYSTEM. THE EVENTUAL SYSTEM WOULD NOT DEVELOP TACTICAL CONCEPTS. THEY WOULD BE DEVELOPED ELSEWHERE AND HARMONIZED BY THE SYSTEM. ALSO, NATO MUST ANALYZE THE MISSION NEEDS IDENTIFIED BEFORE INCORPORATION INTO NATIONAL CYCLES.

B. RE PARA 18B, REF A, WE DO NOT AGREE WITH DROPPING OUR FOOTNOTE ON PARA 12(B)(IV), REF B. ALTHOUGH CONSIDERATION OF ORGANIZATION CHANGES MAY BE POSTPONED UNTIL AFTER THE SUMMIT, WE SHOULD NOT FALL OFF OUR POSITION ON STRENGTHENING MAS WITH WHICH (AS YOU INDICATE) THE EWG AGREED PREVIOUSLY. HOWEVER, WE COULD AGREE AS TRADEOFFS TO DROPPING THE NONDESCRIPT SUB-POINTS IN PARA 12(B)(IV), WHICH LIMIT MORE THAN THEY ADD.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 108455

16. ANNEX J (CONSUMER LOGISTICS):

A. RE PARA 19A, REF A, WE AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION EXCEPT THAT YOUR FINAL FALLBACK POSITION FOR THE DPC/PS SHOULD ALSO CHANGE THE WORDS "ESTABLISHED IN HEADQUARTERS AFCENT." FYI. ADDING A FEW ADDITIONAL LOGISTIC PERSONNEL TO AFCENT STAFF WILL NOT PROVIDE THE CAPABILITY NECESSARY TO IMPROVE THE LOGISTIC COORDINATION CAPABILITY SO URGENTLY NEEDED. A SEPARATE AGENCY UNDER AFCENT WILL PROVIDE THE CAPABILITY FOR EXPANSION TO MEET THE LOGISTICS IMPROVEMENTS WE ARE SEEKING TO MAKE. END FYI.

B. WE AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION IN PARA 19B, REF A, EXCEPT YOU SHOULD NOT CONCUR IN THE DELETION OF THE WORDS "AN ADDITIONAL" IN LINE 6, PARA 7, REF B, AS REQUESTED BY BELGIUM AND FRG IN FOOTNOTE (3).

C. WE AGREE WITH MISSION POSITION IN PARA 19F, REF A, EXCEPT THAT YOU SHOULD TRY TO USE FALLBACK

POSITION IN EWG IN THE FACE OF CONTINUED CONSENSUS
OPPOSITION. HOWEVER WE WISH STRONG STATEMENT IN EWG
ON NEED TO FACE UP TO GREATER NATO LOGISTIC ROLE.

17. IN ADDITION WE SHOULD INSIST THAT COVER NOTE
BY THE CHAIRMAN, EWG, FORWARDING THE REPORT TO THE
SECRETARY GENERAL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE
TO INSURE THAT THE NECESSARY FOLLOW-UP IS MADE ON
SUBSIDIARY MEASURES IN TASK FORCE REPORTS WHICH
ARE NOT TAKEN UP IN THE COMPREHENSIVE REPORT:
"CONCERNING THE SUBSIDIARY MEASURES DISCUSSED IN
PARA 9, THE EWG WILL PREPARE THE NECESSARY
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DPC IN PERMANENT SESSION FOR
THE ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POST-SUMMIT
REVIEW OF ALL TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS NOT TAKEN
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 108455

UP IN THE LTDP COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.

VANCE UNQUOTE CHRISTOPHER

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 26 sep 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: POLICIES, MEETINGS, MILITARY PLANS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978STATE108455
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: OSD/ISA: RFISS
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: D780187-0289, D780181-0603
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t197804109/baaaeymz.tel
Line Count: 566
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 2134bda6-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 11
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 04220 DTG 251820Z APR 78; B. AC/281 (LTP) UP
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2829122
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: LONG TERM DEFENSE PROGRAM - EWG MEETING 2 MAY
TAGS: MPOL, US, NATO
To: USMISSION USNATO INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/2134bda6-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014